

HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBART

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

No. C10-1823-JLR

MICROSOFT'S 3/22/12
MOTION TO SEAL

NOTED FOR:
Friday, March 30, 2012

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Microsoft respectfully requests permission to file under seal Exhibit 3 to the Declaration of Douglas I. Lewis filed in support Microsoft's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity (the "Lewis Declaration"). Exhibit 3 to the Lewis Declaration is a true and correct copy of Motorola Mobility, Inc.'s and General Instrument Corp's Second Amended Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions, served on March 9, 2012.

Microsoft seeks to file Exhibit 3 to the Lewis Declaration under seal pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(g) and Paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the Protective Order Regarding The Disclosure

1 and Use of Discovery Materials entered by the Court on July 21, 2011 (ECF No. 72) (the
 2 “Protective Order”). Exhibit 3 contains several hundred pages that refer to and describe
 3 Microsoft’s proprietary source code for Windows 7 and Internet Explorer 9. These pages have
 4 been appropriately designated as “Contains Confidential Business Information and
 5 Confidential Source Code Subject to Protective Order.” This is the only document Microsoft
 6 seeks to file under seal in connection with its Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity.

7 Public disclosure of the information contained in Exhibit 3 would expose Microsoft to
 8 significant risk of commercial harm. For this reason, Microsoft respectfully requests that the
 9 Court permit Exhibit 3 to remain filed under seal. Microsoft’s underlying Motion for
 10 Summary Judgment, as well as the Lewis Declaration and the other exhibits thereto, are being
 11 filed as part of the public record.

12 **II. FACTS & AUTHORITY**

13 A. **The Protective Order and Applicable Court Rules Permit Microsoft’s** 14 **Confidential Business Information To Be Filed under Seal.**

15 Pursuant to the Protective Order, Microsoft is permitted to file Confidential Business
 16 Information¹ or other trade secrets under seal. Paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the Protective Order
 17 govern the filing of documents under seal. Paragraph 2(a) provides:

18 Any information submitted in pre-trial discovery or in a pleading, motion, or
 19 response to a motion in this action, either voluntarily or pursuant to order, and
 20 which is asserted by a supplier to contain or constitute Confidential Business
 21 Information shall be so designated by such supplier in writing...and shall be
 22 segregated from other information being submitted. Documents shall be clearly
 23 and prominently marked on their face with the legend: “[SUPPLIER’S NAME]
 24 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION, SUBJECT TO
 25 PROTECTIVE ORDER” or a comparable notice. During the pre-trial phase of
 this action, such information, whether submitted in writing or in oral testimony,
 shall be disclosed only *in camera* before the Court and shall be filed only under

24 1 “Confidential Business Information” is defined in the Protective Order as “information which has not been made
 25 public and which concerns or relates to the trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work, or apparatus, or to
 the production, sales, shipments, purchases, transfers, identification of customers, inventories, amounts or source
 of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures.” Protective Order, ¶1.

1 seal, pursuant to Rule 5(g) of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District
 2 Court for the Western District of Washington.

3 Paragraph 8 likewise provides that:

4 Any Confidential Business Information submitted to the Court in connection
 5 with a motion or other proceeding within the purview of this action shall be
 6 submitted under seal pursuant to paragraph 2 above.

7 *Id.*, at ¶ 8.

8 In addition, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recognize that courts may permit
 9 parties to file “trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial
 10 information” under seal. Rule 26(c)(1)(G) and (H). District courts “are in the best position to
 11 weigh the fairly competing needs and interests of the parties affected by discovery,” in crafting
 12 the appropriate treatment of documents for which protected treatment is requested. *Seattle*
Times Co. v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20, 36, 104 S. Ct. 2199 (1984); *see also Phillips v. General*
Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1211-1212 (9th Cir. 2002). Further, pursuant to Local Rule CR
 13 5(g)(2), the Court may seal a document filed in support of a dispositive motion upon a
 14 “compelling showing that the public’s right of access is outweighed by the interests of the
 15 public and the parties in protecting the court’s files from public review.” *See also Kakakama*
v. City and Cnty of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006).

16 While the public generally enjoys a right to inspect and copy public records, “it is
 17 uncontested … that the right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute. Every court
 18 has supervisory power over its own records and files, and access has been denied where court
 19 files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications,*
Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 598, 98 S. Ct. 1306 (1978). One such “improper purpose” is where the
 20 commercial business information at issue is sought to be used as a “source[] of business
 21 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Id.* (denying access to copies
 22 of tapes played at trial and noting that courts refused public access to their files where granting
 23 such access might “become a vehicle for improper purposes,” including causing a litigant
 24

1 competitive harm); *see also Network Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.*, No. C-07-
 2 06053, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21721 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010) (granting motion to seal
 3 source code).

4 **B. Compelling Reasons Exist for Maintaining under Seal Documents that Disclose**
Non-Public and Commercially Sensitive Information Regarding Microsoft's
Source Code; Disclosure Creates an Unreasonable Risk of Competitive Harm with
No Countervailing Benefit to the Public.

5 Exhibit 3 to the Lewis Declaration contains references to and descriptions of
 6 Microsoft's non-public, proprietary source code for its Windows 7 and Internet Explorer 9
 7 software programs. This information is highly confidential and commercially sensitive. In the
 8 ordinary course of its business, Microsoft takes great care to protect against unauthorized
 9 disclosure of this information. While this information may be of interest to Microsoft's
 10 competitors, the general public has no legitimate non-commercial use for technical information
 11 of this nature. Microsoft seeks to file Exhibit 3 under seal because it contains Microsoft's
 12 proprietary intellectual property, the disclosure of which would create an unreasonable risk of
 13 commercial or competitive harm to Microsoft with no valid countervailing benefit to the
 14 public.
 15

16 Microsoft has attempted to limit the amount of sealed information to the minimum
 17 necessary to protect its commercially sensitive information. Microsoft is not requesting to file
 18 its underlying Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity, the Lewis Declaration, or any
 19 other exhibits thereto under seal. Microsoft seeks only to file Exhibit 3 under seal, for the
 20 reason that it discloses confidential commercial information regarding Microsoft's Windows 7
 21 and Internet Explorer 9 source code. This document has already been properly designated as
 22 "Confidential Business Information" under the terms of the Protective Order. Microsoft
 23 believes it should remain protected from public disclosure.
 24

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 Microsoft has filed Exhibit 3 to the Lewis Declaration under seal based on its good
3 faith belief that this document qualifies for protection under the terms of the Protective Order,
4 Rule 26(c), and Local Rule CR 5(g)(2). As set out above, there are compelling reasons to
5 maintain Exhibit 3 under seal. Microsoft respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion.

6 DATED this 22nd day of March, 2012.

7 DANIELSON HARRIGAN LEYH & TOLLEFSON LLP

8 By s/ Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr.

9 Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751
10 Christopher Wion, WSBA #33207
11 Shane P. Cramer, WSBA #35099

12 By s/ T. Andrew Culbert

13 T. Andrew Culbert, WSBA #35925
14 David E. Killough, WSBA #40185
15 MICROSOFT CORPORATION
16 1 Microsoft Way
17 Redmond, WA 98052
18 Phone: 425-882-8080; Fax: 425-869-1327

19 David T. Pritikin, *Pro Hac Vice*
20 Richard A. Cederoth, *Pro Hac Vice*
21 Douglas I. Lewis, *Pro Hac Vice*
22 John W. McBride, *Pro Hac Vice*
23 David Greenfield, *Pro Hac Vice*
24 William Baumgartner Jr., *Pro Hac Vice*
25 David Giardina, *Pro Hac Vice*
26 Constantine Trela, Jr., *Pro Hac Vice*

27 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
28 One South Dearborn
29 Chicago, IL 60603
30 Phone: 312-853-7000; Fax: 312-853-7036
31 Brian R. Nester, *Pro Hac Vice*
32 Carter Philips, *Pro Hac Vice*
33 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
34 1501 K Street NW
35 Washington, DC 20005
36 Telephone: 202-736-8000; Fax: 202-736-8711

37 Counsel for Microsoft Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 22, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

**Attorneys for Defendants Motorola Solutions, Inc., Motorola Mobility, Inc., and
General Instrument Corporation**

Ralph Palumbo
Philip S. McCune
Lynn M. Engle
Summit Law Group

Steven Pepe
Jesse J. Jenner
Norman Beamer
Paul M. Schoenhard
Ropes & Gray

s/ Linda Bledsoe
LINDA BLEDSOE